Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE )
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
in his capacity as the )
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )

Plaintiff, )

VS. )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, )
Defendants. )

VOLUME I OF THE VIDEOTAPED

DEPOSITION OF BILLY CLAY, PhD, produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above styled and numbered cause, taken on the 24th day of March, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.



		Page 27
1	E. coli in poultry workers?	
2	A Not in humans. I've done it lots in animals.	
3	Q When?	
4	A Oh, starting about 1975 through 1998.	
5	Q Are any of those studies peer reviewed and	09:33AM
6	published?	
7	A All of those studies were for proprietary	
8	purposes.	
9	Q My question is, were any of those studies peer	
10	reviewed and published?	09:33AM
11	A The answer is no.	
12	Q Let me ask you some general questions, sir.	
13	Do you prefer to not drink water that has taste and	
14	odor?	
15	A Well, if I did, I'd have to quit drinking	09:34AM
16	water in Stillwater, and I would have had to have	
17	done it about 45 years ago.	
18	Q So it's okay with you to taste have a taste	
19	and odor to your water at this point?	
20	A I don't find that there is a taste and odor,	09:34AM
21	although it exists in the minds of some.	
22	Q Do you personally value the attribute of clear	
23	and colorless water?	
24	A Clear and colorless water?	
25	Q Yes, sir.	09:34AM

		Page 58
1	is that what I understand you to say?	
2	A Well, that was the context of your question as	
3	I understood it, that that's what you were trying to	
4	get me to focus on, and so I responded accordingly.	
5	Q Okay. So but my question is, you've not	10:24AM
6	studied whether or not runoff occurs either, not	
7	just water quality measurements?	
8	A I can tell you that wherever rain falls and	
9	streams occur, there is some kind of runoff.	
10	Q Okay, and in that runoff will it contain the	10:25AM
11	constituents of poultry manure that has been land	
12	applied?	
13	A It may or may not.	
14	Q Okay. Did you, sir, have an opportunity to	
15	read Dr. Dicks' testimony in his deposition in this	10:26AM
16	case?	
17	A I did not read his testimony. Oh, wait a	
18	minute, wait a minute. His deposition, I did read	
19	some excerpts from it, yes, I did.	
20	Q Okay. Did you look at any of the exhibits in	10:26AM
21	his deposition given in this case?	
22	A I don't believe I did.	
23	Q Are you familiar with a Dwayne Edwards and a	
24	T. C. Daniel?	
25	A Yes.	10:27AM

		Page 59
1	Q And are you familiar with their published	
2	literatures about runoff in the Illinois River	
3	watershed?	
4	A I'm familiar with their published literature	
5	on simulated runoff.	10:27AM
6	Q Okay, and you're saying it's simulated because	
7	they might simulate rainfall; correct?	
8	A Yes, as well as manure application.	
9	Q Okay. Are you familiar with a gentleman by	
10	the name of Heathman who did a similar study on	10:27AM
11	runoff in 1995?	
12	A Heathman?	
13	Q Yes, sir.	
14	A I don't remember that one.	
15	Q Are you familiar with a gentleman by the name	10:27AM
16	of Pote, P-O-T-E, who in 2005 did a runoff	
17	simulation or study on Bermuda grass?	
18	A That one is vaguely familiar, but I don't	
19	remember the details of that.	
20	Q Okay. Are you familiar with a gentleman by	10:27AM
21	the name of Schroeder and others who in 2004 did a	
22	runoff study off of fescue?	
23	A Vaguely.	
24	Q Are you familiar with Dr. Sharpley who in 1999	
25	did a study about runoff?	10:28AM

		Page 82
1	Q So did you then adjust the weight based upon	
2	the handbook, Exhibit 7, generated by that animal	
3	unit that you just described?	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q All right. So for the animal unit, it would	10:57AM
6	exceed the 63 pounds?	
7	A That's correct.	
8	Q All right. So on a comparison basis, is	
9	did you use the animal waste I'm sorry, the	:
10	animal unit based upon a thousand pounds live weight	10:57AM
11	or just upon those the beef, the beef cow, the	
12	cow, the heifer and replacement heifers alone?	
13	A What we did is when we computed the heifers	
14	contributor, bull contributor, we wound up with a	
15	1.3 animal unit level for the beef animal, beef cow	10:57AM
16	et al, which then, therefore, was translated on the	
17	basis of a thousand pounds body weight.	
18	Q Okay. So in doing that calculation, you	
19	didn't break it down to how many bulls there are,	
20	how many cows there are and how many heifers there	10:58AM
21	are at a given time in the watershed, did you, and	
22	then calculate them per thousand pounds?	
23	A No. What we did at that time was used the	
24	standard data of what an animal unit represents in a	
25	cow-calf herd.	10:58AM
l		

			Page 83
1	Q	And when you say standard data, what is the	
2	author	ity and source of the standard data	
3	A	Well, that	
4	Q	Let me finish my question.	
5	A	Okay. Sorry.	
6	Q	to use a 1.3 animal unit as you have used?	
7	A	The standard data is that that's what the	
8	agricu	ltural economists use as their basis for	
9	making	those decisions of comparison, and so in that	
10	I had	an agricultural economist doing this work for	10:59AM
11	me, he	used that standard data, dataset, that they	
12	use it	every day they're making computations	
13	pertai	ning to beef cattle.	
14	Q	Do you know that for a fact or is that just	
15	someth	ing you've been told?	10:59AM
16	A	Well, I've seen it many other in many other	
17	cases.	I've seen it in the NRCS data as well.	
18	Q	You've seen the definition of an animal unit,	
19	in tal	king about beef, to be 1.3 units?	
20	A	Yes.	10:59AM
21	Q	And can you give me any written authority that	
22	states	that as a standard?	
23	A	From my recall, I can't, but if it's	
24	necess	ary, I'll look it up and get it for you.	
25	Q	And who is the ag economist that you relied on	10:59AM

		Page 84
1	in order to formulate this 1.3 unit?	
2	A His name is Raleigh Jobes.	
3	Q Is he still with Oklahoma State University?	
4	A He's emeritus.	
5	Q Did he do the calculations for you?	11:00AM
6	A Yes.	
7	Q Looking again at Exhibit 7 and the	
8	characteristics of the beef weight as excreted and	
9	the poultry waste as excreted in Tables 4-8 and	
10	4-14, would you agree with me that the poultry	11:00AM
11	waste, as excreted for total solids, exceeds that of	
12	beef weight waste characteristics as excreted?	
13	A Excuse me, sir. Give me the pinpoint again.	
14	4-8	
15	Q Table 4-8 and Table 4-14.	11:01AM
16	A And do you have the Bates number there?	
17	Q 150 and 146.	
18	A 146, and the question then is	
19	Q What's the general well, the total solids	
20	listed there are anywhere from 11.6 to 13; do you	11:01AM
21	agree?	
22	A On beef cattle, yes, sir.	
23	Q Yes, sir, and if you compare that to the	
24	poultry waste characterization as excreted on Page	
25	150, you'll find the total solids there are all 25	11:01AM
1		

		Page 87
1	You were asking me essentially what is the dry	
2	weight of the excreted manure, which is the which	
3	is the total solids in this case, and it was 13	
4	compared to 25.	
5	Q And you understand that we're not talking	11:04AM
6	about poultry litter or bedding material when we're	
7	talking about excreted waste, are we?	
8	A That's the way I understood it.	
9	Q Okay. For purposes of your making opinions in	
10	this case, you've not conducted any field study or	11:04AM
11	independent analysis of the characteristics of	
12	waste; is that true?	
13	A In the Illinois River watershed?	
14	Q No. For any animals that you're opining on	
15	with regard to your report.	11:04AM
16	A No, not in this case, I have not.	
17	Q So it's fair to say you've relied on certain	
18	resources that you chose to use in order to make	
19	those comparisons; true?	
20	MR. GRAVES: Object to the form.	11:05AM
21	A Well, you gave me one of those and said is	
22	this, and I said yes, it's one of them.	
23	Q It's one of them, but that's my point. You've	
24	not done anything independently; you're relying on	
25	resources for the information that you're using to	11:05AM

		Page 88
1	compare characteristics of waste when giving an	
2	opinion in this case?	
3	A And knowledge and experience, as well as that	
4	of Dr. Raleigh Jobes.	
5	Q Okay, and your knowledge and experience is not	11:05AM
6	based upon any independent analysis of either beef	
7	or poultry waste, as excreted, characteristics, is	
8	it?	
9	A No. My knowledge and experience is I've been	
10	involved in studies in which we were measuring dry	11:05AM
11	weight.	
12	Q Okay. Other than dry weight, have you been	
13	involved in any other studies with regard to the	
14	characteristics of beef or poultry manure as	
15	excreted?	11:06AM
16	A Yes. Well, yes, more than dry weight. There	
17	have been instances where we're interested in the	
18	total nutrients, particularly the major nutrients.	
19	Q And did you in fact conduct the study yourself	
20	to evaluate the total nutrients in waste?	11:06AM
21	A Participated in.	
22	Q Okay, and was that paper published and peer	
23	reviewed?	
24	A It wasn't for the purpose of the paper. It	
25	was for the purpose of approval of a pharmaceutical	11:06AM

		Page 118
1	A I'm trying to recall whether it was past 3.5	
2	or not. I can't remember. Seems to me it was	
3	closer to 3.	
4	Q You would agree, sir, that in making your	
5	report and opinions contained in that report, you	11:58AM
6	did not use the actual poultry production numbers	
7	that are provided by the integrators?	
8	A Let me make sure I understand your question.	
9	I think you asked me did I use the production	
10	numbers provided by the integrators, and the answer	11:58AM
11	was that I used this in a comparative basis because	
12	I made estimates, as well as other people who have	
13	made estimates, and I used it as part of the	
14	comparator.	
15	Q The primarily the primary tool that you	11:59AM
16	relied on in establishing poultry production numbers	
17	was the 2002 Ag Census, was it not?	
18	A Yes, that's correct.	
19	Q Do you agree that that Ag Census does not	
20	provide bird production by integrators?	11:59AM
21	A Yes, I do.	
22	Q And do you agree that it provides the census	
23	information by either a state level, county level or	
24	a ZIP Code?	
25	A Yes.	11:59AM

		Page 119
1	Q It does not provide census information based	
2	upon watersheds, does it?	
3	A No.	
4	Q Do you agree that it was necessary well,	
5	let me ask you this way: Who made the assumptions	11:59AM
6	and calculations for the bird numbers; was that Mr.	
7	Jobes or was that you?	
8	A Mr. Jobes made the calculations and I made the	
9	assumptions.	
10	Q Okay. Had you ever performed the task of	12:00PM
11	calculating bird production in the manner that you	
12	did it in this case before?	
13	A Not exactly in this manner, no.	
14	Q Okay. Tell me what other manner you've	
15	employed in calculating bird production numbers.	12:00PM
16	A Just just using census data and tabulating.	
17	Q And what was there a confined area a	
18	defined area that you were requested to make those	
19	calculations for?	:
20	A Well, the Illinois River watershed, this case.	12:00PM
21	Q I'm sorry. I misspoke then. I misunderstood	
22	what you said. Let me ask it this way: Have you,	
23	other than in this case, prepared calculations on	
24	the production of poultry for any other location	
25	than the IRW?	12:00PM
İ		

		Page 123
1	Q Let me rephrase it then.	
2	A Okay.	
3	Q Are there any other integrators besides the	
4	defendants in this case raising poultry in this	
5	watershed?	12:04PM
6	A I don't know of any.	
7	Q Did you make any inquiry to determine if there	
8	was?	
9	A I did, but that was cursory also.	
10	Q How did you go about doing that inquiry?	12:04PM
11	A I don't remember who it was I was asking, but	
12	I think I was asking some people at Oklahoma State	
13	University that Raleigh Jobes knew, an economist who	
14	had spent some time looking at production in the	
15	watershed.	12:04PM
16	Q Tell the court why you didn't use the actual	
17	poultry production numbers prepared by the	
18	defendants for your work in this case.	
19	A Because I was using the census data of the	
20	year 2002 for all other information, and as we	12:05PM
21	viewed it, it was only appropriate to use the same	
22	census data for the poultry numbers as well.	
23	Q Do you know that the information, in looking	
24	at the interrogatory responses of the defendants,	
25	provided 2002 data?	12:05PM
1		

		Page 124
1	A Yes, I do know that.	
2	Q All right, and so even though the 2002 data	
3	was available from the integrators, tell the court	
4	why you didn't use that but instead used the Ag	
5	Census.	12:05PM
6	A I answered that for you earlier, but I'll	
7	answer it again. I said I used it as comparator	
8	data, along with all of the other people who had	
9	made estimates that I had available to me, and it	
10	was comparator data, just like the Smith, Alexander	12:06PM
11	data was comparator data. So that was the reason.	
12	I was using a format that I had chosen we had	
13	chosen, and I was comparing it to others.	
14	Q Okay, and, again, though, the principal method	
15	in which you made your calculation relied on	12:06PM
16	analyzing ZIP Codes in the Illinois River watershed	
17	and the Ag Census that is reported pursuant to those	
18	ZIP Codes; is that correct?	
19	A That is correct.	
20	Q Let me just so we can identify it on the	12:06PM
21	Record, let me hand you Exhibit 17. I'll represent	
22	to you that the first page is a summary page along	
23	with the second page, but I've prepared basically a	
24	compilation of responses provided by the defendants	
25	in this case.	12:07PM

			Page 126
1	Α	No.	
2	Q	Have you been told by any of the poultry	
3	integ	rator defendants they have not applied any	
4	poult	ry waste in the Illinois River watershed now or	
5	in th	e past from their operations?	12:08PM
6	A	No.	
7	Q	What effort did you undertake to quantify the	
8	amoun	t of poultry waste that is generated in the	
9	Illin	ois River watershed?	
10	A	Well, I made an estimate of the total poultry	12:09PM
11	produ	ction for 2002, and I used the sources of	
12	infor	mation that we previously described in the	
13	vario	us documents that show production of manure	
14	and/o	r litter, as well as constituents, and made	
15	those	calculations accordingly.	12:10PM
16	Q	Were you provided any waste calculation	
17	numbe	rs from the poultry integrator defendants that	
18	they	had compiled from history?	
19	A	No.	
20	Q	Were you provided any data from the poultry	12:10PM
21	integ	rator defendants to assist you in quantifying	
22	the a	mount of poultry waste generated in the	
23	Illin	ois River watershed?	
24	A	No.	
25	Q	Did you look at any data to determine what	12:10PM
1			

		Page 248
1	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form, asked and	
2	answered.	
3	A I agree that in order for bacteria to survive	
4	anywhere, desiccation is a negative and pH can be a	
5	negative and sunlight can be a negative. So to try	04:33PM
6	to answer your question, yes, moisture is important.	
7	Q Did you, sir, undertake or any other defendant	
8	experts to your knowledge undertake any study with	
9	regard to the fate and transport of bacteria in the	
10	Illinois River watershed?	04:34PM
11	A Not to my knowledge.	
12	Q Do you know whether or not any modeling	
13	efforts were made to determine the fate and	
14	transport of bacteria in the Illinois River	
15	watershed?	04:34PM
16	A Not to my knowledge.	
17	Q Let me hand you Exhibit 46, Dr. Clay. I think	
18	you'll recognize that document.	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q Is this a document actually prepared by you	04:34PM
21	for the preliminary hearing conducted back in	
22	February and March?	
23	A It appears to be.	
24	Q Did anyone assist you in preparing this	
25	document?	04:35PM

			Page 249
1	A	Yes.	
2	Q	Who did?	
3	A	Dr. Raleigh Jobes.	
4	Q	What part of this document did he contribute	
5	to?		04:35PM
6	A	The calculation of the numbers.	
7	Q	So he just did the math; is that what you're	
8	saying	7?	
9	A	Correct.	
10	Q	And who supplied the numbers for him to be	04:35PM
11	adding	up?	
12	A	Well, as explained earlier, we used a similar	
13	approa	ch, the differences here are that in this	
14	phase,	as I explained earlier in our in the	
15	deposi	tion, we relied on some TMDL studies that	04:35PM
16	for th	ne source of much of that information, and we	
17	used t	the 1998-'99 ASAE data to make the	
18	calcul	ations, and then when the Canadian River study	
19	came t	to into being that was approved by the EPA,	
20	then w	we moved to the 2003 dataset, and they were	04:36PM
21	quite	different, particularly in fecal coliform	
22	bacter	ria, and so it changed those numbers somewhat,	
23	but ir	this case the original studies here were	
24	based	on the 1998 ASAE.	
25	Q	Okay. So that I understand what you're	04:36PM

		Page 251
1	Let's look at Exhibit 8 and ask you if this ASAE	
2	February '03 standard is what you believe was the	
3	source material for the Canadian River TMDL?	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q So let me ask you this: What was the source	04:39PM
6	material for calculating the fecal coliform	
7	production levels in Exhibit 46 that I just handed	
8	to you?	
9	A That was the 1998. At least part of it was	
10	from 1998 ASAE.	04:39PM
11	Q And did you go and obtain the materials from	
12	the ASAE schedules or did Raleigh Jobes do that for	
13	you?	
14	A I think he did that.	
15	Q Are you familiar with a TMDL of bacteria	04:39PM
16	conducted in Frederick and Clark County, Virginia	
17	published in 2004?	
18	A What was the name of it? Was it Frederick and	
19	Clark County TMDL?	
20	Q It was the Abrams Creeks and I don't know how	04:40PM
21	to pronounce it, O-P-E-Q-U-O-N.	
22	A I believe I am, yes.	
23	Q Did you rely on or use any of the materials	
24	from that TMDL?	
25	A I can't remember if I did or not, but I do	04:40PM
		04:40PM

		Page 260
1	poultry litter after you put on a layer or two, and	
2	you will actually have some fermentation going on	
3	there.	
4	Q And you're talking about fermentation on the	
5	floor of the house or in a pile that's been stored?	04:52PM
6	A Both.	
7	Q And what have you done to clinically establish	
8	fermentation in poultry litter sitting in the barn	
9	floor?	
10	A I haven't.	04:52PM
11	Q And what I don't see any studies in your	
12	materials and that doesn't mean they're not there,	
13	but can you point me to any study that uses the term	
14	fermentation?	
15	A No, not that uses the term fermentation, but	04:52PM
16	that's a term I picked up from a personal	
17	communication with a researcher at the University of	
18	Georgia, and she was telling me about the analysis	
19	of bacteria in poultry litter versus fresh droppings	
20	and pointed out to me that as the poultry litter	04:53PM
21	accumulates in the house, you actually have heating	
22	that goes on, and part of that heating is what	
23	raises the temperature within the poultry house;	
24	therefore, you have to control the environment, and	
25	that's part of the drying process as well, and	04:53PM
1		

		Page 263
1	A Yes.	
2	Q And my point, though, is, that term,	
3	fermentation, is not used in those manuals, are	
4	they?	
5	A No, no.	04:56PM
6	Q Have you undertaken any study or reviewed any	
7	studies that quantify the amount of die-off rate	
8	that occurs in a four to five-inch depth of poultry	
9	litter while chickens are in the houses on that	
10	litter?	04:57PM
11	A I haven't performed any studies, no.	
12	Q Is the do you agree that the killing of the	
13	microorganisms by composting is dependent upon the	
14	depth of the stacked pile?	
15	A Well, yes, it can be, but it's also dependent	04:57PM
16	upon drying.	
17	Q If we leave the poultry stacked at four to	
18	five inches in the house, are you telling me that at	
19	some point eventually in the field it's going to dry	
20	out to where the microorganisms all will be dead in	04:57PM
21	it?	
22	A Let me remind you that composting is dependent	Ī
23	upon a moisture percentage. If you don't have a	-
24	minimum moisture percentage, you won't have a good	
25	composting rate. The whole point here is that	04:58PM

			Page 268
1	of the	e 111, basically 55,000? Tell me what occurred	
2	in ord	ler for that to happen.	
3	A	Oh, under poultry?	
4 ′	Q	Yes, sir.	
5	A	Oh. That that referred to the poultry loss	05:12PM
6	of bac	eteria due to drying.	
7	Q	How did you arrive at a 50 percent reduction	
8	in col	iform counts for drying that you say occurs?	
9	A	That was from a couple of articles that were	
10	read,	and I think Dr. Jobes actually provided that	05:12PM
11	inform	nation.	
12	Q	Are those articles in your considered	
13	materi	lals?	
14	A	I don't think they're in there, but I can get	
15	them i	in there.	05:13PM
16	Q	I don't recall seeing anything that would say	
17	that.	So I need to see those articles.	
18	Α	Okay.	
19	Q	And explain to me, is this the drying that	
20	occurs	s when the poultry litter is sitting on the	05:13PM
21	barn i	floor when the chickens are in there?	
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	And so is the number at the top table where	
24	it's :	111,000 fecal coliform, is that an excreted	
25	colif	orm count?	05:13PM

		Page 270
1	going to be 25, thereabouts.	56 46 57 58 58 58 58
2	Q Is part of that drying effect as a result of	
3	having the bedding material there?	
4	A That's part of it. The major part of it is	
5	surface drying with air movement.	05:15PM
6	Q Okay, and, again, what's your authority that	
7	in fact there is such a reduction in what you say a	
8	rapid period of time; what do you rely on for that	
9	statement; is there a study; is there anything that	
10	you rely on from the study or reported paper?	05:15PM
11	A I can look in any of these studies or these	
12	guidance documents, and they will tell me that	
13	litter harvested ranges from 20 to 30 percent.	
14	Q And would you agree with me that when litter	
15	is harvested, it's been in there for a period of a	05:15PM
16	year, sometimes a little longer?	
17	A But poultry crapped on it yesterday.	:
18	Q Okay, and that's your point?	
19	A That's my point.	
20	Q Okay, and you're going to get me the articles	05:15PM
21	to show the die-off rate is 50 percent?	
22	A I'll get that.	
23	Q There was another article you cited for this	
24	fermentation process by Kelley, and it's Exhibit No.	
25	36. Can you tell me where in that article it uses	05:16PM

		Page 271
1	the term fermentation?	
2	A He doesn't. As I said, and I'll repeat that,	
3	it was not a good choice of terms on my part.	
4	Q If you'll look at Page 281 of the Kelly sample	
5	or not sample but paper.	05:17PM
6	A Okay.	
7	Q It says in the first full paragraph, the first	
8	sentence, litter subsamples were collected initially	
9	at time intervals of two, four, eight and	
10	sixteen-week storage using sterile equipment. Do	05:17PM
11	you see that?	
12	A Oh, second, okay, yes.	
13	Q Okay. So now we know what they're collecting	
14	and what time period. Dropping down to the last	
15	full sentence of that same column where it starts	05:17PM
16	after the Footnote 15 is recited there, it says	
17	litter samples of approximately 5 grams were dried	
18	in a vacuum drying oven at 105 degrees centigrade	
19	for approximately four hours to determine percentage	
20	moisture content so that microbial numbers were	05:17PM
21	expressed on a dry weight basis. Can you tell us	
22	what they did there?	
23	A Well, they cultured the bacteria originally,	
24	but then they wanted to know what how many	
25	bacteria they had on a dry-unit basis.	05:18PM

			Page 288
1	A	No.	
2	Q	So at the time that it's reported, it may very	
3	well b	e that the next day or next week or next month	
4	it the	n is applied, but it would be in the same	
5	year;	would you agree with that?	05:38PM
6	A	It could be.	
7	Q	Okay.	
8	A	But the point, sir, in this is that I didn't	
9	subtra	ct carryover, nor did I subtract stored from	
10	anythi	ng. The only thing I subtracted is to look	05:38PM
11	at is	the known exported.	
12	Q	Okay, and let's talk about that. You used	
13	2002 p	roduction for the amount of waste that's being	
14	produc	ed; correct?	
15	A	That was the reference I had available to me.	05:39PM
16	Q	Okay, all right. Well, we'll talk about that	
17	later,	but why would you deduct the amount that's	
18	being	hauled out in 2007 when it was never hauled	
19	out in	2002?	
20	A	Well, it was beginning to be hauled out before	05:39PM
21	2007.		
22	Q	Well, did you take a look to see how much was	
23	produc	ed in 2002 to compare how much was produced in	
24	2007?		
25	А	No.	05:39PM

		Page 289
1	Q So if more birds are being grown in 2007 than	
2	are grown in 2002, we agree that the waste	
3	production is going to be greater also, don't we?	
4	A That could be.	
5	Q And you've done nothing to account for that in	05:39PM
6	your calculations, have you?	
7	A Well, I haven't, but if that's an issue for	
8	you, we'll go to what is produced, 295,000 tons.	
9	Q So your well, that's your opinion about	
10	what's produced; correct?	05:39PM
11	A Well, isn't it my opinion we're trying to get?	
12	Q Well, and I'm asking you, and I'm going to ask	
13	you how you base that opinion later.	
14	A Yeah.	
15	Q But that's your opinion?	05:39PM
16	A That's my opinion.	
17	Q And you know that there are other opinions	
18	that are much greater than that?	
19	A I list them here.	
20	Q Okay. Well, you don't list them all, do you?	05:40PM
21	A I list the ones that were available to me in	
22	this litigation that I've seen produced, information	
23	produced.	
24	Q Well, didn't Dr. Fisher testify to greater	
25	amounts than what you've listed here?	05:40PM
1		

1 counts, did you take into consideration the 2 decomposing bodies of birds that may end up in 3 burial pits? 4 MR. GRAVES: Object to form.	05:48PM
3 burial pits?	05:48PM
	05:48PM
4 MR. GRAVES: Object to form.	05:48PM
	05:48PM
5 A NO.	
6 Q Did you look at or consider the contribution	
7 of nutrients contributed from the decomposing bodies	
8 of poultry that may have been buried in the IRW?	
9 MR. GRAVES: Same objection.	
10 A I did not.	05:48PM
11 Q Did you take into consideration the nutrient	
12 contributions of the birds in the compost when it's	
13 land applied?	
14 A I did not.	
MR. BOND: Object to form.	05:48PM
MR. GARREN: I'll finish with this exhibit	
17 and we'll stop. How's that?	
18 MR. GRAVES: That's fine.	
19 MR. ELROD: Thanks.	
20 Q I've handed you Exhibit 43, Dr. Clay.	05:50PM
21 A Yes.	
22 Q And that's the Exhibit F, I believe, from your	
23 appendices.	
24 A Yes.	
25 Q Who prepared the calculations that are shown	05:50PM

		Page 297
1	in Exhibit F or Appendix F?	
2	A Dr. Jobes.	
3	Q And what was your contribution to the creation	
4	of Exhibit F, which is that first page after the	
5	title page?	05:50PM
6	A My contribution was the information about time	
7	spent grazing, loafing, et cetera, and the basin	
8	management study.	
9	Q Look in the upper left-hand corner. It says	
10	in parenthesis in the first box there, it appears	05:51PM
11	that the Alexander report is missing other cattle,	
12	referring to a category. Is that a statement you	
13	made or Jobes?	
14	A I did make that statement.	
15	Q Okay, and we're referring to the 1997 data or	05:51PM
16	the 2002 data when you said that?	
17	A 2002 data.	
18	Q Okay. The far right column, second block down	
19	where it talks about estimated '97 values on	
20	percentage for the OCC values, do you see that?	05:52PM
21	A Yes.	
22	Q And there's a number in there for 53,200?	
23	A Yes.	
24	Q Is that the number of cattles number of	
25	cattle data that was described in the OCC document	05:52PM

tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  correct?  A They counted them, yes.  All right, and they made no statement that			Page 298
Q All right. So that's just the total number of  4 cattles that are there; correct?  5 A That's the total number they identified. 05:52PM  6 Q Of those cattle, how many did you assume had  7 direct access to streams?  8 A All of them.  9 Q And why did you do that?  10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM  11 presenting.  12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement  13 in that report, did they?  14 A That was my interpretation.  15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	1	in your materials?	
4 cattles that are there; correct?  5 A That's the total number they identified. 05:52PM  6 Q Of those cattle, how many did you assume had  7 direct access to streams?  8 A All of them.  9 Q And why did you do that?  10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM  11 presenting.  12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement  13 in that report, did they?  14 A That was my interpretation.  15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	2	A In subwatershed in Oklahoma.	
5 A That's the total number they identified. 6 Q of those cattle, how many did you assume had 7 direct access to streams? 8 A All of them. 9 Q And why did you do that? 10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM 11 presenting. 12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement 13 in that report, did they? 14 A That was my interpretation. 15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM 16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed; 17 correct? 18 A They counted them, yes. 19 Q All right, and they made no statement that 20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	3	Q All right. So that's just the total number of	
6 Q Of those cattle, how many did you assume had 7 direct access to streams? 8 A All of them. 9 Q And why did you do that? 10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM 11 presenting. 12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement 13 in that report, did they? 14 A That was my interpretation. 15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM 16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed; 17 correct? 18 A They counted them, yes. 19 Q All right, and they made no statement that 20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	4	cattles that are there; correct?	
direct access to streams?  A All of them.  Q And why did you do that?  A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM  presenting.  Well, in fact, they never made that statement  in that report, did they?  A That was my interpretation.  Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  correct?  A They counted them, yes.  Q All right, and they made no statement that  each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  that study?  A They made the statement that cattle generally  have access to streams, and we saw one of those	5	A That's the total number they identified.	05:52PM
8 A All of them. 9 Q And why did you do that? 10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM 11 presenting. 12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement 13 in that report, did they? 14 A That was my interpretation. 15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM 16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed; 17 correct? 18 A They counted them, yes. 19 Q All right, and they made no statement that 20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	6	Q Of those cattle, how many did you assume had	
9 Q And why did you do that?  10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM  11 presenting.  12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement  13 in that report, did they?  14 A That was my interpretation.  15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  13 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	7	direct access to streams?	
10 A Because I believe that's what they were 05:52PM  11 presenting.  12 Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement  13 in that report, did they?  14 A That was my interpretation.  15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  13 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	8	A All of them.	
presenting.    12    Q	9	Q And why did you do that?	
Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement in that report, did they?  A That was my interpretation.  Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed; correct?  A They counted them, yes.  Q All right, and they made no statement that each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM that study?  A They made the statement that cattle generally have access to streams, and we saw one of those	10	A Because I believe that's what they were	05:52PM
in that report, did they?  A That was my interpretation.  Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  correct?  A They counted them, yes.  Q All right, and they made no statement that  each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  that study?  A They made the statement that cattle generally  have access to streams, and we saw one of those	11	presenting.	
14 A That was my interpretation.  15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM  16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	12	Q Well, in fact, they never made that statement	
15 Q Okay. What they actually showed in those 05:52PM 16 tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed; 17 correct? 18 A They counted them, yes. 19 Q All right, and they made no statement that 20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	13	in that report, did they?	
tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;  correct?  A They counted them, yes.  All right, and they made no statement that  each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in  that study?  A They made the statement that cattle generally  have access to streams, and we saw one of those	14	A That was my interpretation.	
17 correct?  18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	15	Q Okay. What they actually showed in those	05:52PM
18 A They counted them, yes.  19 Q All right, and they made no statement that  20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM  21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	16	tables were number of cattle in a subwatershed;	
19 Q All right, and they made no statement that 20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	17	correct?	
20 each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in 05:52PM 21 that study? 22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	18	A They counted them, yes.	
21 that study?  22 A They made the statement that cattle generally  23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	19	Q All right, and they made no statement that	
22 A They made the statement that cattle generally 23 have access to streams, and we saw one of those	20	each of those cattle had direct access, did they, in	05:52PM
have access to streams, and we saw one of those	21	that study?	
	22	A They made the statement that cattle generally	
24 statements earlier, but we don't know exactly how	23	have access to streams, and we saw one of those	
	24	statements earlier, but we don't know exactly how	
25 many. 05:53PM	25	many.	05:53PM

		Page 299
1	Q Okay, but so and I believe that statement	
2	was not was either some or most; correct?	
3	A Yes, and they also made a statement in there	
4	that the cattle are such a significant contributor,	
5	they act essentially as point source.	05:53PM
6	Q But that's for the ones who have directly	w w
7	deposited; correct?	
8	A They were making a statement about cattle,	
9	like they did a bunch of categorical things.	
10	Q Okay. Point of it is, sir, some or most would	05:53PM
11	not necessarily mean 100 percent normally, would it?	
12	A Probably not 100 percent.	
13	Q Okay. You said that in the footnotes down	
14	below that cattle spend on average 13.7 hours per	
15	day in loafing areas, and then below that you said	05:54PM
16	assume the same for dairy cattle. Is that what	
17	you're assuming?	
18	A Yes.	
19	Q And on what basis did you have to assume that	
20	dairy cattle would spend the same amount of time	05:54PM
21	loafing per day?	
-22	A Dairy cattle actually have more time to loaf.	
23	Q And didn't you, though, also say that that	
24	loafing occurs in riparian areas?	
25	A They're in the same setting or similar setting	05:54PM

Page 304

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE )
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT, )
in his capacity as the )
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )

Plaintiff, )

VS. )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, )

Defendants. )

VOLUME II OF THE VIDEOTAPED

DEPOSITION OF BILLY CLAY, PhD, produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above styled and numbered cause, taken on the 25th day of March, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

		Page 313
1	A I did not.	**************************************
2	MR. GARREN: Did we introduce No. 5	
3	yesterday?	
4	COURT REPORTER: We did.	
5	Q Let's try and find that document, if we could,	08:44AM
6	Dr. Clay.	
7	A Just a minute and I'll walk through them. Is	
8	this the one you're talking about?	
9	Q Yes, sir. I was trying to get them	
10	straightened out. I believe we talked a little bit	08:45AM
11	about this yesterday, but you used this in part as	
12	one of your references, did you not?	
13	A I did.	
14	Q Let's go to page Bates numbered 78 and look at	
15	the table there and the table that precedes it on	08:45AM
16	Page 77 and start with 78. Table 1-6 shows typical	
17	litter production as removed from production	
18	analysis. Did you use these numbers in making your	
19	calculations?	
20	A Some of these numbers, yes.	08:45AM
21	Q When I say you, let me clarify that. Did you	
22	specifically take these numbers and give them to Mr.	
23	Jobes or did you rely on Mr. Jobes to go and get the	
24	numbers, make the calculations for you?	
25	A Some of both. Mr. Jobes and I worked together	08:46AM

			Page 314
1	on tha	t.	
2	Q	Okay.	
3	A	It's Dr. Jobes.	
4	Q	Dr. Jobes, thank you. Let's just talk about	
5	him re	eal quick while we're there. Is he employed at	08:46AM
6	this t	ime?	
7	A	He's an emeritus faculty at Oklahoma State	
8	Univer	esity.	
9	Q	How long have is this the first time you	
10	worked	d with him in preparing a paper or a report as	08:46AM
11	you've	e done here?	
12	Α	Yes, it is.	
13	Q	What's his education?	
14	Α	He has a PhD in agricultural economics.	
15	Q	Who pays him for the work he's done?	08:46AM
16	A	Well, the in this case the defendants.	
17	Q	Is it Ozark International that's paying him?	
18	A	Yes.	
19	Q	You're not paying him from your expenses?	
20	A	No.	08:47AM
21	Q	All right. How was it you came to use Dr.	
22	Jobes	?	
23	A	Well, I've known Dr. Jobes for a while. We	
24	live :	in the same section of land for that matter,	
25	and I	know he's an agricultural economist, and I	08:47AM

		D 215
		Page 315
1	know he's done many of these kinds of things for	
2	Oklahoma State University. So I sought him out and	
3	asked him if he would be interested.	
4	Q All right. Have you worked with him on any	
5	other projects besides the one to prepare your	08:47AM
6	expert report?	•
7	A Yes.	
8	Q What kind of projects have you worked with him	
9	on?	
10	A We worked on a dairy project. It was a	08:47AM
11	essentially a dairy economics project, but it had to	
12	do with disease status of the animals as well, and I	
13	worked on the disease status and he worked on the	
14	economics.	
15	Q Did he write any of the report that's	08:47AM
16	presented under your name in this expert report?	
17	A No.	
18	Q Did he prepare most of the appendices or all	
19	of the appendices that are attached to your report?	
20	A Yes.	08:48AM
21	Q Is the Poultry Waste Management Handbook an	
22	authority relied on by the scientific community for	
23	purposes of determining waste characteristics with	
24	poultry?	
25	A It's one of them.	08:48AM

		Page 319
1	Q Okay, all right. I'm with you now. Thanks.	
2	What was the average weight of the broilers that you	
3	utilized for calculations?	
4	A 2.25 pounds.	
5	Q And is that tell us why you used that	08:53AM
6	weight.	
7	A Well, they start off at ounces and wind up at	
8	5 pounds, 5.2 pounds.	
9	Q So the mature weight you used is 5.2 pounds?	
10	A I think that was the 5.13 I believe. I'd	08:53AM
11	have to go back to look to be exact, but it's my	
12	recollection.	
13	Q And so you just didn't take the average or	
14	median to get to the 2.25?	
15	A No. We used that from a standard, and Dr.	08:53AM
16	Jobes had that standard that he uses routinely.	:
17	Q Is that standard in your considered materials?	
18	A I think it is. I think it's stated in there.	
19	Q Can you tell me what I would look for to find	
20	that standard as I don't believe I've ever seen it?	08:54AM
21	A I cannot remember, but we believe that from	
22	experience, that the 2.25 is the average number that	
23	should be used to calculate the total.	
24	Q I understand you believe that, but I'm asking	
25	for your authority that you rely on other than just	08:54AM

		Page 320
1	your belief.	
2	A Dr. Jobes.	
3	Q All right, and did Dr. Jobes provide you a	
4	document or materials that were considered by you	
5	and as part of your considered material produced to	08:54AM
6	the State?	
7	A Well, I don't remember. I noticed your	
8	consultants used a similar number in making their	
9	calculations.	
10	Q Similar but not the same?	08:55AM
11	A Not exactly.	
12	Q Did Dr. Jobes tell you where he got that	
13	number?	
14	A He probably did.	
15	Q And you don't have a recollection today?	08:55AM
16	A No.	
17	Q Did you do anything to confirm or validate the	
18	5.13 pounds for a broiler produced in the IRW?	
19	A I think I did produce a document showing that.	
20	Q What was that document?	08:55AM
21	A It showed it was a USDA quoted document	
22	that the Delmarva association of poultry folks	
23	published, and they did the national number. In	
24	2002 I believe it was 5.13 pounds.	
25	Q Did you do anything to document the size of	08:56AM
Ī		

			Page 324
1	show	on those birds?	
2	A	This one is eight weeks, and it shows 6 and a	
3	half.		
4	Q	And the second page?	
5	A	Another eight weeks at 7.	08:59AM
6	Q	And the next page shows how many pounds?	
7	A	Nine weeks at 8.	
8	Q	And the next one?	
9	A	Nine weeks at 8.	
10	Q	And the next one at seven weeks?	08:59AM
11	A	Yes, seven weeks at 5.	
12	Q	And that's a 1999 settlement sheet. Do you	
13	see t	hat at the top?	
14	A	I do.	:
15	Q	The next one, we have small straight runs. Do	09:00AM
16	you k	now how many small birds they grow?	
17		MR. BOND: Object to the form.	
18	A	Where are we here?	
19	Q	I'm looking at the very next page.	
20	A	Where it says six weeks?	09:00AM
21	Q	Yes, sir.	
22	A	4 pounds.	
23	Q	Okay. Do you know how many as opposed to	
24	the 1	arger broilers we saw on the first page, did	
25	you d	etermine how many small broilers are raised?	09:00AM
I			

		Page 326
1	there.	
2	Q Let's let's go back just a second. All	
3	right? For your work in this case you did not	
4	access this data in order to calculate the type and	
5	size of birds being grown, did you?	09:01AM
6	MR. BOND: Object to the form. What data?	
7	A I will have to ask you to restate that because	
8	I want to understand.	
9	Q The actual information prepared by the	
10	integrators showing the size and type of birds grown	09:01AM
11	in the IRW, you did not access that data in order to	
12	make your calculations for the size or weight of	
13	birds; correct?	
14	A I told you in the very beginning that the	
15	numbers I used, and you're holding it up there in	09:02AM
16	your left hand.	
17	Q Just answer my question. Did you access the	
18	data that the integrators had?	
19	A I did not.	
20	Q All right. Now, in front of the first colored	09:02AM
21	page is there a page that's called U.S. broiler	
22	chicken performance?	
23	A First colored page, okay. Yes.	
24	Q Now, is that the document that has your Clay	
25	1050 page number on it that you referenced earlier	09:02AM
1		

		Page 327
1	that you said was your source for the size of birds?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q All right. That doesn't say 5.13 on it,	
4	though, does it?	
5	A Well, that was just from recall.	09:02AM
6	Q Now, in order to get to the number of birds	
7	that you calculated are in the IRW, you relied on	
8	the census through the ZIP Code dataset; is that	
9	correct?	
10	A Yes.	09:03AM
11	Q And you downloaded that dataset or did Mr	
12	Dr. Jobes download that dataset?	
13	A Dr. Jobes did.	
14	Q All right, and he made the calculations from	
15	that let me ask it this way: Who made the	09:03AM
16	calculations to assign what percentage of each ZIP	
17	Code would be in the IRW?	
18	A He did that.	
19	Q What assumptions did he make in the	
20	allocation, if you will, of the birds within the ZIP	09:03AM
21	Code?	
22	A Well, they're reported in the ZIP Code.	
23	Q I'm sorry. I didn't make my question very	
24	clear. In talking about those that lie in and	
25	outside of the boundaries of the IRW	09:04AM

			Page 328
1	A	Oh.	
2	Q	what assumptions and allocations did he	
3	make t	to calculate the birds?	
4	A	When we ordered the ZIP Code data, they sent	
5	it in	hard copy form, as well as by E-mail. They	09:04AM
6	told ı	is what percentage of the ZIP Code was in the	
7	county	y of each of the ZIP Codes that were involved.	
8	We the	en did an overlay over the watershed and	
9	deter	mined what percentage of the ZIP Code was in	
10	the wa	atershed.	09:04AM
11	Q	And how was that overlay done?	
12	A	It was done with a computer.	
13	Q	And who did that?	
14	A	He did that.	
15	Q	And do you know what he used in order to make	09:04AM
16	the o	verlay?	
17	A	I don't remember.	
18	Q	Did you see him do the work?	
19	A	I saw it after he had it in place.	
20	Q	Do you agree that the census provides some	09:04AM
21	confi	dentiality in the reporting of data that it	
22	colle	cts for the farmers?	
23	A	Yes, I do.	
24	Q	Let me hand you what is marked as Exhibit No.	
25	9. H	ave you seen that before on the Ag Census	09:05AM
]			

		Page 329
1	website?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q And it has a notation there where it shows an	
4	asterisk under the particular ZIP Code that was	
5	pulled for this example.	09:05AM
6	A Uh-huh, yes.	
7	Q Read to the court and jury what the footnote	
8	describes the purpose of the asterisk in the dataset	
9	to be.	
10	A It says, data withheld for categories with one	09:06AM
11	to four farms. Farm counts in these ZIP Codes are	
12	included in the state total category.	
13	Q All right.	
14	A And when they report it, they use a D instead	
15	of an asterisk.	09:06AM
16	Q And did what adjustment, if any, did Dr.	
17	Jobes make in the calculations for data that was not	
18	reported?	
19	A He didn't include them if they didn't report	
20	it.	09:06AM
21	Q Okay. Did Dr. Jobes do any calculation for	
22	margin of error estimates for the work he performed	
23	in making these calculations?	
24	A Restate that again, sir.	
25	Q Did you or Dr. Jobes make any calculation to	09:06AM

			Page 330
1	deter	mine a margin of error for the estimates made	
2	from	the calculations for the number of poultry	
3	being	produced?	
4	A	No.	
5	Q	Let me hand you what's Exhibit 38 and ask you	09:07AM
6	if you	a recall seeing that document.	
7	A	Yes. It looks familiar.	
8	Q	That's, in fact, Table BA from your	
9	appen	dices, is it not?	
10	A	Yes.	09:07AM
11	Q	All right. Do you see where circles have been	
12	enter	ed on the lower portion of this document?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	And do you see where they have circled some	
15	aster	isks that appear there?	09:07AM
16	А	Yes.	:
17	Q	And do you agree with me, sir, that based on	
18	the p	rior exhibit, this is ZIP Codes listed that	
19	have	no data based upon the fact there's one to four	
20	farms	in that ZIP Code?	09:08AM
21	A	I am.	
22	Q	Is that your understanding of why that's	
23	there	?	
24	A	It is.	
25	Q	All right, and you're saying that Dr. Jobes	09:08AM

		Page 331
1	did not make any adjustment for those; correct?	
2	A No. We were aware that there was an under	
3	estimate on turkeys.	
4	Q All right, and did you contact the integrator	
5	that produces turkeys in this case to determine how	09:08AM
6	many turkeys they produce in the IRW?	
7	A We didn't.	
8	Q All right. Looking at I believe there's a	
9	ZIP Code at the very last page the ZIP Code in	
10	Delaware County is 74964. It would be the very last	09:08AM
11	page, almost to the middle of the	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q Do you see where the two circles are shown	
14	there, one for a broiler and one for turkeys sold?	
15	A I do, I do.	09:08AM
16	Q So that would indicate no disclosure or no	
17	data provided for broilers or turkeys in that ZIP	
18	Code; correct?	
19	A That's correct, because there was just I think	
20	two. I think there were two.	09:09AM
21	Q Did what you say you think there were	
22	two. Two what?	
23	A Two farms.	
24	Q And did you do anything to validate or confirm	
25	what you thought was true or not true?	09:09AM

		Page 332
1	A No. We knew that there would be some under	
2	estimate in a few places, but we were looking at a	
3	gross estimate to begin with.	
4	Q If you could find Exhibit 17 and we'll just	
5	look at that real quick and leave that handy I	09:09AM
6	guess.	
7	A 17?	
8	Q Yes, sir. That's going to be the discovery	
9	materials showing the bird numbers with the summary	
10	page on the front.	09:09AM
11	A I hope I didn't go past it again.	
12	Q It's a rather thick one.	
13	A Okay. I see it.	
14	Q Look under the column of 2002, and can you	
15	tell me which integrator produces turkeys in the	09:10AM
16	watershed?	
17	A Well, Cargill produces some turkeys.	
18	Q Okay, and what is the number of birds produced	
19	in 2002 by Cargill?	
20	A They say 2.8 million.	09:10AM
21	Q And do you recall how many birds, turkeys you	
22	used in your calculations for turkeys being	
23	produced?	
24	A Yes.	
25	Q What was it?	09:10AM
1		

1 A 669,000. 2 Q Okay. That's about 2.2 dollar 2 million 3 birds 2.2 millions birds short of what they say; 4 correct? 5 A Correct. 09:10AM 6 Q Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census 7 form. Have you seen these documents before or this 8 particular document? 9 A I've looked at it, yes. 10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM 11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which 12 deals with hogs and pigs. 13 A Section okay. 14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll 15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM 16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used 17 for? 18 A It's a census form for individual producers to 19 fill out. 20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM 21 Census data that you used in preparing your 22 calculations in this case? 23 A Correct. 24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef 25 cows. 09:12AM				Page 333
3 birds 2.2 millions birds short of what they say; 4 correct? 5 A Correct. 09:10AM 6 Q Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census 7 form. Have you seen these documents before or this 8 particular document? 9 A I've looked at it, yes. 10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM 11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which 12 deals with hogs and pigs. 13 A Section okay. 14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll 15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM 16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used 17 for? 18 A It's a census form for individual producers to 19 fill out. 20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM 21 Census data that you used in preparing your 22 calculations in this case? 23 A Correct. 24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	1	A	669,000.	
4 correct?  5 A Correct. 09:10AM  6 Q Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census  7 form. Have you seen these documents before or this  8 particular document?  9 A I've looked at it, yes.  10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM  11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which  12 deals with hogs and pigs.  13 A Section okay.  14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	2	Q	Okay. That's about 2.2 dollar 2 million	
5 A Correct. 09:10AM 6 Q Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census 7 form. Have you seen these documents before or this 8 particular document? 9 A I've looked at it, yes. 10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM 11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which 12 deals with hogs and pigs. 13 A Section okay. 14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll 15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM 16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used 17 for? 18 A It's a census form for individual producers to 19 fill out. 20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM 21 Census data that you used in preparing your 22 calculations in this case? 23 A Correct. 24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	3	birds	2.2 millions birds short of what they say;	
G Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census form. Have you seen these documents before or this particular document? A I've looked at it, yes. Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which deals with hogs and pigs. A Section okay. Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM Now, can you tell the court what this form is used for? A It's a census form for individual producers to fill out. Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM Census data that you used in preparing your calculations in this case? A Correct. Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	4	correc	t?	
form. Have you seen these documents before or this  particular document?  A I've looked at it, yes.  Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM  numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which  deals with hogs and pigs.  A Section okay.  Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM  Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  for?  A It's a census form for individual producers to  fill out.  Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  Census data that you used in preparing your  calculations in this case?  A Correct.  Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	5	A	Correct.	09:10AM
8 particular document? 9 A I've looked at it, yes. 10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM 11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which 12 deals with hogs and pigs. 13 A Section okay. 14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll 15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM 16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used 17 for? 18 A It's a census form for individual producers to 19 fill out. 20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM 21 Census data that you used in preparing your 22 calculations in this case? 23 A Correct. 24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	6	Q	Let's look at Exhibit 40, a 2002 Ag Census	
9 A I've looked at it, yes.  10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM  11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which  12 deals with hogs and pigs.  13 A Section okay.  14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	7	form.	Have you seen these documents before or this	
10 Q Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page 09:11AM  11 numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which  12 deals with hogs and pigs.  13 A Section okay.  14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	8	partic	cular document?	
numbers. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which deals with hogs and pigs.  A Section okay.  Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll start with the cattle. It's the next page over.  Now, can you tell the court what this form is used for?  A It's a census form for individual producers to fill out.  Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag Census data that you used in preparing your calculations in this case?  A Correct.  Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	9	A	I've looked at it, yes.	
deals with hogs and pigs.  A Section okay.  Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  start with the cattle. It's the next page over.  Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  for?  A It's a census form for individual producers to  fill out.  Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag  Census data that you used in preparing your  calculations in this case?  A Correct.  Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	10	Q	Okay. Unfortunately, we don't have page	09:11AM
13 A Section okay.  14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over.  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	11	number	es. I'll have to refer you to Section 9, which	
14 Q Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll  15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over. 09:11AM  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	12	deals	with hogs and pigs.	
15 start with the cattle. It's the next page over.  16 Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	13	A	Section okay.	
Now, can you tell the court what this form is used  17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	14	Q	Well, actually let's go to Section 10. We'll	
17 for?  18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	15	start	with the cattle. It's the next page over.	09:11AM
18 A It's a census form for individual producers to  19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	16	Now,	can you tell the court what this form is used	
19 fill out.  20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM  21 Census data that you used in preparing your  22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	17	for?		
20 Q And is this the form that ends up in the Ag 09:12AM 21 Census data that you used in preparing your 22 calculations in this case? 23 A Correct. 24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	18	A	It's a census form for individual producers to	
Census data that you used in preparing your  calculations in this case?  A Correct.  Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	19	fill	out.	
22 calculations in this case?  23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	20	Q	And is this the form that ends up in the Ag	09:12AM
23 A Correct.  24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	21	Census	s data that you used in preparing your	
24 Q Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	22	calcu	lations in this case?	
00.1071//	23	A	Correct.	
25 cows. 09:12AM	24	Q	Under 1A of this form, it talks about beef	
	25	cows.		09:12AM

		Page 334
1	A Yes.	
2	Q And it says include beef heifers that had	
3	calved; correct?	
4	A Which in essence is cows.	
5	Q Okay, and then under 1C it talks about other	09:12AM
6	cattle, which are heifers, steers, calves and bulls	
7	combined; isn't that true?	
8	A Yes.	
9	Q All right. Doesn't that cover all of the	
10	cattle that would exist in a given period for	09:12AM
11	purposes of a census?	
12	A That exist, yes.	
13	Q All right, and can you tell the court why it	
14	is then you added a bull in your calculations and	
15	additional heifer replacements in your use of the	09:12AM
16	1.3 animal unit calculation?	
17	A To produce the manure and the total amount o	f
18	material that's within the manure.	
19	Q You didn't rely then on just the census, did	
20	you?	09:13AM
21	A I told you from the beginning I relied on th	е
22	census, plus the data that's available to support	
23	that.	
24	Q Wouldn't you agree with me, sir, the	
25	definitions for the type of beef cow and other	09:13AM

		Page 335
1	cattles that are listed here would include heifers	
2	whether they're replacements or not?	
3	A Yes, but if you'll look closely at our	
4	calculations, what we did in determining or using	
5	those that 1.3, we didn't put the calves in	09:13AM
6	there. We put the heifers in there but no calves	
7	were included. Now, what you have in other cattle,	
8	although it's not spelled out here, is that there	
9	are a lot of cattle that are bought and sold in the	
10	watershed. There are also a lot of cattle calves	09:13AM
11	that are carried over from one year to the next to	
12	grow them.	
13	Q And aren't those all intended to be picked up	
14	in the census by the definition of the beef cows and	
15	other cattles?	09:14AM
16	A And that's what the producer does. They just	
17	count all of those cattle, add them up and put them	
18	in there.	
19	Q All right. So you would have them all in	
20	those counts, would you not?	09:14AM
21	A That's right. They'll all be in there in	
22	other cattle.	
23	Q And notwithstanding that, you still added more	
24	to it in order to do your numbers, didn't you?	
25	A Did not add more to it.	09:14AM

			Page 336
1	Q	Well, you used a 1.3 versus a 1, didn't you.	
2	Doesn	't that additional .3 include part of a bull,	
3	addit	ional heifers that are being	
4	A	1-25th of a bull.	
5	Q	Okay, and it includes replacement heifers,	09:14AM
6	doesn	't it?	
7	A	Heifers but no calves.	
8	Q	All right, but all the heifers are supposed to	
9	be ac	counted for by this document; don't you agree?	
10	A	As far as the production of manure and/or its	09:14AM
11	const	ituents, the difference between the heifers	
12	that	would be included in the 1.3 and the calves is	
13	a was	h because the calves, there are about 81,000 of	
14	them	or could be 81,000 of them, which were not	
15	accou	nted when we were doing that, and the heifers	09:14AM
16	are t	wo heifers per eight cows.	
17	Q	Where did you get your calf number that you	
18	just	referred to?	
19	A	Calf crop.	
20	Q	And where did calf crop?	09:15AM
21	Α	About 80 percent calf crop.	
22	Q	And that's an estimate on your part; correct?	
23	A	That's an estimate.	
24	Q	It's not coming from the Ag Census?	
25	А	No.	09:15AM

		Page 337
1	Q Didn't come from any actual sales in the	
2	watershed, did it?	n (chinaria de la companio de la com
3	A It came from some animal science people that I	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
4	talked to in the University of Arkansas and also in	
5	the Oklahoma and	09:15AM
6	Q Who are the animal science people?	# E
7	A The animal science guy was the department head	
8	over there, and I'm trying to remember his name. It	
9	escapes me right now, but I talked to him about	
10	that.	09:15AM
11	Q And did he have a data source to rely on or do	
12	you know?	
13	A I'm confident he has a data source. That's	
14	his business.	
15	Q You're confident, but do you know, sir, that	09:15AM
16	he referred to that as	
17	A I don't have it in my hands, and I did not use	
18	it. I used his word for it.	
19	Q All right. He didn't produce any document to	
20	your	09:15AM
21	A No, he did not.	
22	Q You have nothing to verify the conversation or	
23	the numbers that he gave you; correct?	
24	A I'm telling you what happened.	
25	Q Turn back one page in the same exhibit. Would	09:16AM

		Page 338
1	you agree with me that the definition of replacement	
2	gilt would be included in the inventory request	
3	under 1A and 1B of this form?	
4	A There could be some replacement gilts in	
5	there, yes.	09:16AM
6	Q Dr. Clay, let me hand you Exhibit No. 50, sir,	
7	and represent to you this is an aerial that's taken	
8	in the spring of 2005, and it's overlaid with a ZIP	
9	Code showing the broken orange and red line for ZIP	
10	Code 74964, the one we referenced earlier.	09:17AM
11	A Yes.	
12	Q You thought there were two farms in there that	
13	were not located under the Ag Census; is that	
14	correct?	
15	A I believe that's right, yeah. I can't	09:17AM
16	remember.	
17	Q All right. Do you see the red circles that	
18	have names by them?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q And in particular, do you see the name Steve	09:18AM
21	Butler?	
22	A I do.	
23	Q You see it three times, do you not?	
24	A Yes.	
25	Q And do you know how many birds he was	09:18AM

		Page 339
1	producing in those barns during the period of time?	
2	A No.	
3	Q Do you know how many birds were produced prior	
4	to Mr. Butler operating these farms in 2002?	
5	A No.	09:18AM
6	Q Look at the next page of this exhibit, and	
7	I'll represent to you this is a public document kept	
8	by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture under the	
9	Poultry Registration Act that requires number of	
10	birds/house for the year. Have you ever seen this	09:18AM
11	form before?	
12	A No.	
13	Q Do you see where it says grand total	
14	birds/house for this year on the first page of OKDA	
15	4929?	09:18AM
16	A Yes.	
17	Q And what is the number?	
18	A The number is 4 million.	
19	Q And that shows this to be birds produced	
20	I'm trying see the upper left-hand corner, the	09:18AM
21	name Steve Butler, Green Country Farms, 11, 12, 13	
22	and 14?	
23	A I see that.	
24	Q All right. Go to the next page. Do you see	
25	the Steve Butler Farms 15 and 16 on this page?	09:19AM

		Page 340
1	A Yes.	
2	Q And do you see how many birds were produced in	
3	that year in those barns?	2002
4	A 2 million.	
5	Q 2.2 million. Would you agree with me, sir,	09:19AM
6	that by failing to verify your data from your Ag	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
7	Census, in this one ZIP Code alone, which is not on	
8	a border, you've missed by this grower's production	
9	over 6 million birds alone?	
10	A If I missed them, your consultants also missed	09:19AM
11	them because you got about the same number of total	
12	birds as I did.	
13	Q That didn't answer my question. Do you agree	
14	with me, sir, that you didn't verify your data and	
15	that you missed easily 6 million birds produced by	09:19AM
16	Mr. Butler?	
17	A I may have missed them, yes.	
18	Q All right, and there are other farms located	
19	here. Can you look at this aerial and see that	
20	there are other what appear to be poultry barn	09:19AM
21	structures located within the circles?	į
22	A I saw those.	
23	Q All right. Look at 17 one more time, and the	
24	total birds shown for 2002 on Exhibit 17 is how	
25	much?	09:20AM

		Page 345
1	no calves included.	
2	Q How do you exclude the calves when they're	
3	part of a number that has a grouping of various beef	
4	animals in one number?	
5	A We excluded the calves because the calf crop	09:27AM
6	is based and the census is based on January, and	
7	January is after the producer has sold the bulk of	
8	their calf crop. They sell them in the fall, and	
9	they're born in the early spring, late winter to	
10	early spring, and they keep them on the property	09:27AM
11	about eight months and then they sell them, and	
12	that's the way they make their money.	
13	Q And so your testimony then is that based upon	
14	that process, these calves are never counted in the	
15	Ag Census?	09:27AM
16	A Those calves would not be counted in the Ag	
17	Census, the ones that are sold. Now, if you go to	
18	cattle sold, they may appear there, but we didn't	
19	use that number.	
20	Q Okay, all right. So the census reflects them	09:27AM
21	perhaps under a different category is what you're	
22	saying?	
23	A Correct.	
24	Q And you ignored that category?	
25	A We weren't using it in this case because we	09:28AM
1		

		Page 346
1	wanted to include the heifers as a unit as a part of	
2	the cow.	
3	Q And why wouldn't you just go ahead and pick up	
4	the calves from the calves sold?	
5	A We could have done it that way. We didn't	09:28AM
6	choose to do it that way.	
7	Q Did you make that calculation?	
8	A I don't believe we did.	
9	Q So you don't know whether it's a greater or	
10	lesser amount if you had done it that way, do you?	09:28AM
11	A Well, you take 800,000 calves versus a	
12	fraction of number of heifers. You know, it's a	
13	pretty good trade-off.	
14	Q You didn't do the calculation to determine	
15	what their resale would be?	09:28AM
16	A Oh, I think we did it on just a hand rough	
17	calculation. Dr. Jobes did.	
18	Q Looking at the the line item below this one	
19	where it says replacement heifers, six months at 600	:
20	pounds?	09:28AM
21	A Yes, yes, yes.	
22	Q Okay. Is that a weaned weight?	
23	A Yes, approximately.	
24	Q Okay. What is the type of breed of cattle you	
25	are using to calculate these weights?	09:29AM

		Page 347
1	A These are mixed breeds.	
2	Q And those are?	
3	A Well, there are multiple breeds in	the
4	watershed, both Arkansas and Oklahoma. Th	е
5	preferred type of cattle is cross bred cat	tle 09:29AM
6	because of the heterosis that's involved t	here,
7	meaning hybrid vigor that's involved there	. So
8	you're going to have a lot of English bree	d base
9	cattle that are also crossed on to Contine	ntal
10	cattle.	09:29AM
11	Q Looking at I think it's Table AA, i	t shows
12	here that you've used inventory numbers fo	r the
13	animals on this page. Tell us why you use	d
14	inventory numbers when many or a lot of th	ose are
15	sold basically in a six-month period.	09:30AM
16	A Exactly where are you now?	
17	Q I'm on Table AA where you're listin	g at the
18	top beef cow down through horses and ponie	s.
19	A Oh, okay. I'm sorry.	
20	Q And you're using inventory number;	correct? 09:31AM
21	A Depending on the animal and the foc	us, yes.
22	Q And are not some of those sold duri	ng the
23	year, too?	
24	A Yeah, some could be sold during the	year.
25	Q Did you make any calculation to ref	lect the 09:31AM
I		

		Page 348
1	sale of some of those?	
2	A I don't think we did, but there there's not	
3	very many sold on a relative basis because they're	
4	trying to maintain those those base herds that's	
5	involved. In other words, when you replace the	09:31AM
6	animal, you replace it in the case of cattle with	
7	the heifers.	
8	Q Look quickly at I guess C1, the large and	
9	under the heading where you talk about the broilers,	
10	you show that you use the 2.25 for the weight;	09:32AM
11	correct?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q And five turns at 49 days?	
14	A Yes.	
15	Q Why did you use five turns at 49 days?	09:32AM
16	A We saw that used routinely in State documents.	
17	Q What State documents did you look at that told	
18	you that?	
19	A Well, the basin management document was one of	
20	them.	09:32AM
21	Q Anything else?	
22	A Well, there were several of them. I just	
23	can't remember all of them.	
24	Q Okay. Have you heard that it's not uncommon	
25	to turn flocks as many as six times?	09:32AM

		Page 349
1	A I have heard, yes, that it could be five or	
2	six.	
3	Q Why didn't you use half of that, five and a	
4	half?	
5	A We could have. It would have produced more	09:33AM
6	manure. Would have made a bigger number, yeah,	
7	you're right, but as I said earlier, using the	
8	numbers that we used, we got a total poultry of over	
9	150 million, and that's what about everybody else	
10	got.	09:33AM
11	Q What was your source for your deer information	
12	on this C1, please?	
13	A Deer information was based on harvest data in	
14	the counties adjusted to watershed again.	
15	Q And did you get that information yourself or	09:33AM
16	did Mr. Jobes Dr. Jobes?	
17	A I got most of that information.	
18	Q And how did you get it?	
19	A By telephone.	
20	Q And the ducks data source, what did you rely	09:33AM
21	on to use there?	
22	A good portion of that was from also from	
23	telephone communication, although there were aerial	
24	surveys or there were surveys done of duck counts	
25	from the central flyaway that had been done two or	09:34AM

		Page 350
1	three times. Dr. Jobes took some a lot of those	
2	numbers and compared them to some of the information	
3	I'd gotten by phone, and we arrived at those	
4	numbers.	
5	Q Would you agree with me that those duck and	09:34AM
6	deer information you just cited are not in your	
7	considered materials?	
8	A Oh, I think they are in my considered	
9	materials.	
10	Q So the flyaway information for ducks is in	09:34AM
11	your considered materials?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q All right, and your geese sources, what did	
14	you rely on for your geese source?	
15	A Those same sources.	09:34AM
16	MR. GARREN: Okay. We need to stop to	
17	change the film.	
18	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.	
19	The time is 9:35 a.m.	
20	(Following a short recess at 9:35 a.m.,	09:34AM
21	proceedings continued on the Record at 9:47 a.m.)	
22	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	
23	The time is 9:47 a.m.	
24	Q Dr. Clay, let's look continue to look at	
25	Table C1, and I want to just go through a few items	09:46AM

		Page 351
1	to identify source materials. You have a column	
2	listed, total solids, in the left-hand side of that	
3	spreadsheet. What's the data source relied upon for	
4	the total solids listed in that column?	
5	A I think it's either Chapter 4 or it's ASAE. I	09:47AM
6	can't remember for sure on that.	
7	Q It would be would you have mixed the source	
8	or would you have used only one?	
9	A I I have presented both of them to Dr.	
10	Jobes, and I can't remember which one he used.	09:47AM
11	Q Do you know whether or not he used the same	
12	source throughout the spreadsheet for all the data	
13	that is input when it was available?	
14	A I think he did, and but the source for	
15	bacteria, for example, was not in Chapter 4, but it	09:47AM
16	was in other sources. So he would have had to	
17	acquire that from other places.	
18	Q All right. So other than bacteria, it's your	
19	estimate today or belief that Chapter 4 of the	
20	agricultural waste management handbook would be the	09:48AM
21	source of the data?	
22	A I believe that's right.	
23	Q All right. We need to compare two pages in	
24	this. Explain to me why the fecal coliform for beef	
25	in Table AA is not the same as shown in AE, which I	09:48AM
1		

		Page 354
1	reduced in its total volume or amount, and that's	Control of the Contro
2	what that represents.	
3	Q Is that reduction in volume shown in the Ag	1. 170 miles
4	Waste Management Handbook when looking at manure	
5	versus litter?	09:52AM
6	A No. It's a calculated number.	X.99(2000)
7	Q And it's calculated based upon assumptions	P. production
8	you've made; correct?	
9	A Correct.	
10	Q All right, and what is the basis for your	09:52AM
11	assumptions to make that calculation?	E STATE OF THE STA
12	A It again, Dr. Jobes had that data that he	
13	used routinely for that.	
14	Q And he used routinely in this case; is that	
15	what you mean?	09:52AM
16	A That, and I think he's used it in other cases.	
17	Q Well, is that material within your considered	
18	materials that he relied on in order to make this	
19	calculation?	
20	A I don't believe I had any published document,	09:52AM
21	no.	
22	Q All right. So he just made that calculation	
23	and you accepted it?	
24	A He used that as well. In other words, he did	
25	some reverse calculations using litter, et cetera,	09:52AM
1		

		Page 355
1	and arrived at those numbers to check.	
2	Q And when the litter is removed, it's given an	
3	as-is designation or as-removed, and it has a	
4	basically 25 percent moisture level in it; correct?	
5	A Correct.	09:53AM
6	Q All right. Why didn't you just use those	
7	numbers instead of then drying it a second time?	
8	A Oh, we did. The next level you'll see that.	
9	Q Well, that's my question. When it's removed	
10	and you testified in the PI hearing that when it's	09:53AM
11	spread, it has a moisture content of 25 percent;	
12	correct?	
13	A Correct.	
14	Q So are you saying that drying occurs before it	
15	gets to 25 percent to get to this number or are you	09:53AM
16	drying it again after it's gotten to 25?	
17	A No, no, no, before, before.	
18	Q So why don't you just use the as-removed	
19	litter number that's published in the Ag Waste	
20	Management Handbook?	09:53AM
21	A What we were doing was getting from gross	
22	manure dropped on the litter or came out of the back	
23	end of the bird at 75 percent moisture, allowing it	
24	to sit and be exposed to the elements.	
25	Q The elements inside the barn?	09:53AM

		Page 356
1	A And yes, and the drying process that goes	
2	on there, and also as mentioned earlier, there is	
3	some degree of decomposition that goes on there, and	
4	in that decomposition, there's nitrogen loss and	
5	there's carbon dioxide loss.	09:54AM
6	Q Aren't those things taken into consideration	
7	in the Ag Waste Management Handbook when they show	
8	the characteristics for poultry litter?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q Okay. So my question to you is, why would you	09:54AM
11	change those numbers for calculations in this	
12	lawsuit instead of use what they had published?	
13	A We were just looking at it. As you will see,	
14	we didn't absolutely use those numbers anywhere in	
15	our total calculations. What we did is just lay it	09:54AM
16	out and looking at it from our perspective to look	
17	at. What we looked at was we actually reduced the	
18	manure itself to its absolute dry weight and then	
19	added back the given amount of moisture, as well as	
20	the amount of given amount of organic material,	09:54AM
21	to arrive at that calculation.	
22	Q And that calculation isn't the same that's	
23	published in the Ag Waste Management Handbook, is	
24	it?	
25	A That calculation isn't the same.	09:55AM
1		

		Page 357
1	Q When you took the manure and then you added	
2	back essentially the litter and the moisture	
3	content, didn't you?	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q That's essentially what you're doing?	09:55AM
6	A Yes.	
7	Q Well, my point is, that calculation isn't the	
8	same as is published by the Ag Waste Management	
9	Handbook?	
10	A It's similar.	09:55AM
11	Q But it's not the same, is it?	
12	A It's not absolutely the same, but all of these	
13	are estimates, just like all of the estimates that	
14	were provided by your consultants.	
15	Q Did did the calculation that you performed	09:55AM
16	show that there is a greater or lesser amount of	
17	poultry manure being moved out of the house?	
18	A It showed that it's from all of those	
19	people that have made calculations that were	
20	available to me, it showed that I'm kind of right in	09:55AM
21	the middle of those calculations.	
22	Q As compared to the Ag Waste Management	
23	Handbook, does it show do your calculations show	
24	that	
25	A Mine are similar. Mine numbers are similar.	09:55AM

		Page 358
1	Q I haven't finished the question.	
2	A Oh, I'm sorry.	
3	MR. TUCKER: Remember, you have t	o count to
4	two.	
5	A Yes.	09:56AM
6	MR. ELROD: You need to count to	three.
7	Q Do your calculations when you have	re dried
8	the manure, added back the litter and then	it's
9	removed at that time, that number is greate	er than or
10	lesser than what would be published in the	Ag Waste 09:56AM
11	Management Handbook?	
12	A It's similar. I can't remember the	exact
13	comparison.	
14	Q Isn't it a fact it's less, sir?	
15	A It might be slightly less.	09:56AM
16	Q Do you know?	
17	A I can't remember it to be frank with	n you, but
18	I have several estimates of litter products	ion, and
19	that's what they all are. They're all est	imates.
20	My estimate is different from some of the	others but 09:56AM
21	quite similar.	
22	Q But you went and did some additional	L
23	calculations in order to come up with your	number
24	when in fact the as-is or as-removed litter	r numbers
25	are published in a waste management handboo	ok that 09:57AM

	Page 359
has been adopted and accepted and utilized by	
experts in this field for years; do you agree with	
that?	
A I agree that there are the waste management	
handbook is what year is it '92. I agree that	09:57AM
those numbers are there. I could also tell you that	
no one had the numbers to calculate the amount of	
litter in the Illinois River watershed. We chose a	
method of doing that whereby we did it based on 2002	
census data so that we could estimate a number of	09:57AM
total poultry in the watershed and from that total	
poultry determine how much manure they're likely to	
produce and then convert that to a litter format.	
Q And given the choice in this case when you	
redid these calculations from what's shown in the Ag	09:57AM
Waste Management Handbook, you had a choice, didn't	
you, to use your calculations, which are lower than	
those that are published in the Ag Handbook;	
correct?	
A Actually, I had a choice to take an average of	09:58AM
the lowest estimate and an average of the highest	
estimate. That was a choice. I preferred to take	
the use the choice of my own production data.	
Q And the production data is from your	
methodology of calculating ZIP Code from the Ag	09:58AM
	experts in this field for years; do you agree with that?  A I agree that there are the waste management handbook is what year is it '92. I agree that those numbers are there. I could also tell you that no one had the numbers to calculate the amount of litter in the Illinois River watershed. We chose a method of doing that whereby we did it based on 2002 census data so that we could estimate a number of total poultry in the watershed and from that total poultry determine how much manure they're likely to produce and then convert that to a litter format.  Q And given the choice in this case when you redid these calculations from what's shown in the Ag Waste Management Handbook, you had a choice, didn't you, to use your calculations, which are lower than those that are published in the Ag Handbook; correct?  A Actually, I had a choice to take an average of the lowest estimate and an average of the highest estimate. That was a choice. I preferred to take the use the choice of my own production data.  Q And the production data is from your

		Page 361
1	just talked about where you take simply the manure?	
2	A Yes.	į.
3	Q Dry it independently in your calculation?	
4	A Correct.	
5	Q Add back litter based upon an estimate of what	10:00AM
6	you believe is in the barn; correct?	
7	A Correct.	
8	Q And then reduce that again by another some	
9	additional moisture content reduction; correct?	
10	A Correct.	10:00AM
11	Q Now, did you validate your calculations on the	
12	total amount of litter that has been removed from	
13	the house as compared to what Sheri Herron told you	
14	is normally removed?	
15	A Well, I made comparisons, yes.	10:01AM
16	Q And did you get 190 tons in your calculations	
17	when you did that?	<u>.</u>
18	A Well, I think I reported that in my report.	:
19	Q Do your calculations show that it's 190 tons	
20	being removed after you dried it twice?	10:01AM
21	A No. It's not a matter of 190 tons per house.	
22	This is not based on a house. This is based on	
23	total number of poultry.	
24	Q And how many average poultry are in a house on	
25	a flock?	10:01AM

		Page 362
1	A Well, I didn't do it that way. I just took	
2	the total poultry to make the calculations.	
3	Q So you back to my initial question then,	
4	you didn't verify or validate your calculations	
5	against another known number like Sheri Herron, who	10:01AM
6	knows how much litter is actually pulled out in	
7	tons?	
8	A Yes, I did.	
9	Q And where can you show me you did that?	
10	A Just a moment. Excuse me. It will take me a	10:02AM
11	moment to find it.	
12	Q Are you referencing your report?	
13	A Yes. Page 17 of the report. I show a Herron	
14	number using that 190 tons and 1,800 houses of	
15	307,700 tons, and my number was 295,114, and then I	10:02AM
16	did a calculation based on litter produced from the	
17	handbook, poultry handbook, and calculated 312,000	
18	tons, and so that was a comparator way, a way of	
19	comparing.	
20	Q So the number you have here for Herron/Clay,	10:03AM
21	you're telling me that's 190 tons times 1,800	
22	houses?	
23	A Yes.	
24	Q Back again to the large spreadsheet that we're	
25	on in Exhibit 45.	10:03AM

		Page 371
1	where his waste came from?	
2	A I asked him if I could look at his numbers,	
3	and he said, no, I'm not going to show you my	
4	numbers.	
5	Q Where is he located?	10:14AM
6	A Stilwell Westville, Westville.	
7	Q He's in Oklahoma?	
8	A Yes.	
9	Q Did you ask him whether or not he's a	
10	registered certified applicator?	10:14AM
11	A I didn't.	
12	Q Did he tell you where he hauled it to?	
13	A No.	
14	Q Why didn't you use his numbers in addition to	
15	what Sheri Herron then told you?	10:14AM
16	A I didn't have a documentation of them, so I	
17	didn't use them, and I had documentation for Sheri's	
18	numbers.	
19	Q Can you point me to any published literature,	
20	sir, that validates or uses any calculation that you	10:15AM
21	made in the process of reducing the poultry manure	
22	in the house separately from the litter in	
23	determining an amount as-is or as-removed?	
24	MR. GRAVES: Object to form.	
25	A It was a calculated number that was based on	10:15AM

litter numbers as well as production numbers and the difference, and that was done by Dr. Jobes.  Q Okay. Can you point to me, sir, any source, any data, any authority that supports the calculation method utilized by Dr. Jobes for you in this case and as reflected on this exhibit, which is your page A-S1 Page 5?	
3 Q Okay. Can you point to me, sir, any source, 4 any data, any authority that supports the 5 calculation method utilized by Dr. Jobes for you in 6 this case and as reflected on this exhibit, which is	96.000 (2000) 2000 (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000)
4 any data, any authority that supports the 5 calculation method utilized by Dr. Jobes for you in 10:1 6 this case and as reflected on this exhibit, which is	Į.
5 calculation method utilized by Dr. Jobes for you in 10:1 6 this case and as reflected on this exhibit, which is	
6 this case and as reflected on this exhibit, which is	2000
	.5AM
7 vour page A-S1 Page 5?	
1 1	
8 MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
9 A Yes, an authority is Dr. Jobes.	
10 Q And you're relying solely on him then; is that 10:1	_6AM
11 correct?	
12 A Yes, I am.	
13 Q Okay, and you don't know what he's relying on	
14 in order to make these calculations in the way of	
15 authority or published paper, do you? 10:1	L6AM
16 MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
17 MR. GRAVES: Object.	
18 A I know that Dr. Jobes is a legitimate	
19 agricultural economist and scientist who has many	
years of experience, and I have great confidence in 10:1	16AM
21 him.	
22 Q I understand all of that, sir, but you don't	
23 know if he has a peer-reviewed or a published	
24 document or a manual of any sort that's relied on by	
25 the industry to make the calculation he's made in 10:3	

		Page 373
1	this case, do you?	
2	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
3	A I didn't look at it.	
4	Q Do you know that it exists?	
5	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	10:16AM
6	A I've already answered that.	
7	Q Your answer is you don't know if it exists;	
8	correct?	
9	A That is correct.	
10	Q Did you ask Dr. Jobes to give it to you so you	10:16AM
11	could have it in your considered materials?	
12	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
13	A I did not.	
14	Q So I guess technically Dr. Jobes is your	
15	considered material, isn't he?	10:17AM
16	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
17	MR. GRAVES: Argumentative.	
18	MR. TUCKER: I object to that as nonsense.	
19	Q Well, that's the person you relied on to make	
20	this calculation, isn't it?	10:17AM
21	A He's a very important person to me in all of	
22	this, and he's a knowledgeable individual that I	
23	have confidence in.	
24	Q And he's the person that did the calculation	
25	for you; you didn't do it; correct?	10:17AM
1		

		Page 374
1	A Yes, and I understand that that is a standard	
2	operating procedure for people that know how to do	
3	those things.	
4	Q You understand that from him; correctly?	
5	A Sir, this is not my first rodeo. I've been in	10:17AM
6	this business for many, many years working with	
7	numerous scientists and people who have experience	
8	in this industry, and I have confidence in a lot of	
9	them, including myself.	
10	Q You're not an ag engineer; correct?	10:17AM
11	A I am not an ag engineer.	
12	Q You're not an ag economist?	
13	A I am not an ag economist.	
14	Q All right. You relied solely on Dr. Jobes,	
15	and you didn't get any validating or published	10:18AM
16	material to support the work he did, did you?	
17	A I did not.	
18	Q Let's look at Exhibit 42, Dr. Clay. Did you	
19	have any eye strain working on your spreadsheets in	
20	this case?	10:19AM
21	MR. GRAVES: Object to the form.	
22	A Well, I suppose. It's it hasn't been	
23	nearly as stressful as looking at your documents	
24	today.	
25	Q Did you prepare Exhibit No. 42 or did Dr.	10:19AM
1		

an accurate and fair comparison?  MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.  A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I  understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to  compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?  New York of the land area is devoted to farming,  agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  inclusive of woodlands?  MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.  10:24AM  10:24AM  10:24AM  10:24AM  10:25AM  10:25AM			Page 378
Q Do you agree that to make a fair comparison of items, such as poultry waste and or other manures, comparing it wet to wet or dry to dry makes an accurate and fair comparison? MS. LONGWELL: Object to form. A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?  Correct. A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. A Did you inquire and learn when any of the poultry integrator companies started operating in the IRW? A I don't have dates, no. The IRW? A I don't have dates, no. The IRW agricultural production. Is that 65 percent inclusive of woodlands?  Note that comparison of the comparison of the comparison is to the land area is devoted to farming, agricultural production. Is that 65 percent inclusive of woodlands?  Note that comparison of the co	1	as-removed is I understand that one very clearly.	
4 items, such as poultry waste and or other 5 manures, comparing it wet to wet or dry to dry makes 10:24AM 6 an accurate and fair comparison? 7 MS. LONGWELL: Object to form. 8 A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I 9 understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to 10 compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry? 10:24AM 11 Q Correct. 12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. 13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the 14 poultry integrator companies started operating in 15 the IRW? 10:24AM 16 A I don't have dates, no. 17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65 18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming, 19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent 20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	2	As-removed is taking it out of the house.	
5 manures, comparing it wet to wet or dry to dry makes 6 an accurate and fair comparison? 7 MS. LONGWELL: Object to form. 8 A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I 9 understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to 10 compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry? 11 Q Correct. 12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. 13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the 14 poultry integrator companies started operating in 15 the IRW? 10:24AM 16 A I don't have dates, no. 17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65 18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming, 19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent 20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	3	Q Do you agree that to make a fair comparison of	
an accurate and fair comparison?  MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.  A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I  understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to  compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?  Neglia Correct.  A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.  Did you inquire and learn when any of the  poultry integrator companies started operating in  the IRW?  A I don't have dates, no.  Uniquire and learn when approximately 65  percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM	4	items, such as poultry waste and or other	
MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.  A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I  understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to  compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?  Correct.  A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.  Did you inquire and learn when any of the  poultry integrator companies started operating in  the IRW?  A I don't have dates, no.  In your report, you reported approximately 65  percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	5	manures, comparing it wet to wet or dry to dry makes	10:24AM
8 A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I 9 understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to 10 compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry? 10:24AM 11 Q Correct. 12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. 13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the 14 poultry integrator companies started operating in 15 the IRW? 10:24AM 16 A I don't have dates, no. 17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65 18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming, 19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent 20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	6	an accurate and fair comparison?	
9 understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to 10 compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry? 10:24AM 11 Q Correct. 12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes. 13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the 14 poultry integrator companies started operating in 15 the IRW? 10:24AM 16 A I don't have dates, no. 17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65 18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming, 19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent 20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	7	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
10 compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?  11 Q Correct.  12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.  13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the  14 poultry integrator companies started operating in  15 the IRW?  10:24AM  16 A I don't have dates, no.  17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	8	A Wet to wet I'm trying to make sure I	
11 Q Correct.  12 A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.  13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the  14 poultry integrator companies started operating in  15 the IRW?  10:24AM  16 A I don't have dates, no.  17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	9	understand. You're saying a fair comparison is to	
A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.  13 Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the  14 poultry integrator companies started operating in  15 the IRW? 10:24AM  16 A I don't have dates, no.  17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM  21 A Yes.	10	compare wet to wet versus versus dry to dry?	10:24AM
Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the poultry integrator companies started operating in the IRW? 10:24AM  A I don't have dates, no.  In your report, you reported approximately 65 percent of the land area is devoted to farming, agricultural production. Is that 65 percent inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	11	Q Correct.	
poultry integrator companies started operating in  the IRW?  10:24AM  A I don't have dates, no.  Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	12	A Well, I think that would be reasonable, yes.	
the IRW?  10:24AM  16 A I don't have dates, no.  17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	13	Q Did you inquire and learn when any of the	
16 A I don't have dates, no.  17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands?  10:25AM  21 A Yes.	1.4	poultry integrator companies started operating in	
17 Q In your report, you reported approximately 65  18 percent of the land area is devoted to farming,  19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent  20 inclusive of woodlands?  21 A Yes.	15	the IRW?	10:24AM
percent of the land area is devoted to farming, agricultural production. Is that 65 percent inclusive of woodlands?  Yes.	16	A I don't have dates, no.	
19 agricultural production. Is that 65 percent 20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	17	Q In your report, you reported approximately 65	
20 inclusive of woodlands? 10:25AM 21 A Yes.	18	percent of the land area is devoted to farming,	
21 A Yes.	19	agricultural production. Is that 65 percent	
	20	inclusive of woodlands?	10:25AM
22 O And is that all of the woodlands?	21	A Yes.	
And is clide all of the woodfallas.	22	Q And is that all of the woodlands?	
23 A It's the bulk of the woodlands that's used for	23	A It's the bulk of the woodlands that's used for	
24 agriculture.	24	agriculture.	
25 Q Okay, and tell me how it's used for 10:25AM	25	Q Okay, and tell me how it's used for	10:25AM

		Page 386
1	in the mass balance. Do you recall those	8 8 8 8
2	statements?	
3	A Yes. I think they called it a mass balance,	
4	and I said I didn't believe that it was designed as	
5	a mass balance. It looked to me like it was	10:42AM
6	designed as a as what is produced in the	
7	watershed predominantly.	
8	Q Is that what you said in your report or is	
9	that what you're saying now?	
10	A Well, I'm interpreting what I said in the	10:42AM
11	report. I'm not reading it.	
12	Q All right. Tell the court, if you would,	
13	please, what experience you have with conducting or	
14	performing any mass balances.	
15	A Well, I've not done many mass balances.	10:42AM
16	Q How many	
17	A But I've read about what the components of	
18	mass balances are.	
19	Q How many mass balances have you actually	
20	operated or performed yourself?	10:42AM
21	A I don't know that I've done any.	
22	Q Have you received any specific education or	
23	training in the use of performing a mass balance?	
24	A Well, personal experience and involvement in	
25	the business.	10:43AM

		Page 387
1	Q That's not my question. Have you received any	
2	specific training or education for operations or	
3	performing mass balance?	
4	A No.	
5	Q Do you know if any other experts on the	10:43AM
6	defendants' team have performed a mass balance for	
7	any or all of the IRW?	
8	A Not to my knowledge.	
9	Q Do you recall having any discussions in your	
10	conference calls with regard to mass balance being	10:43AM
11	performed by any or all of the or any of the	
12	experts for the defendants?	
13	A There was some discussion about mass balance.	
14	Whether the individuals were doing those, I don't	
15	know.	10:43AM
16	Q Okay. My question was specifically with	
17	regard to the defendants' experts, whether or not	
18	discussions were conducted that indicated they were	
19	performing a mass balance. Was that ever discussed	
20	in your presence?	10:44AM
21	A I don't remember that there was discussion	
22	that a mass balance was being performed. I remember	
23	a discussion about a mass balance.	
24	Q Okay. Your criticism of Engel and Smith is	
25	that they did not account for all livestock sold or	10:44AM
1		

		Page 392
1	cattle 887?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q And dairy cattle at 1,200?	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q All right, and those are pounds; correct?	10:51AM
6	A Correct, and from those we made calculations	
7	of nitrogen from our aspect and compared it to	
8	calculations that the State had, and so those were	
9	just checker numbers from the total on a relative	
10	basis. Then from that, we calculated the total	10:52AM
11	number that would have access to the streams in the	
12	entire watershed. It was about 79 percent of the	
13	total cattle that we had that we had enumerated.	
14	Q All right. Show me what numbers you are	
15	dividing to get to the 79 percent.	10:52AM
16	A Okay. It would be the well, I can't	
17	remember how Dr. Jobes calculated that, but he it	
18	is it's basically a percentage of the cattle from	
19	our total calculations versus	
20	Q Do you I'm sorry.	10:53AM
21	A versus the calculations that would have	
22	that would have represented the 1997 data projected	
23	to 2002.	
24	Q Okay, and you don't have the ability sitting	
25	here today	10:53AM

		Page 393
1	A I do.	
2	Q to do that calculation, do you?	
3	A I do. I can't do it quickly and simply.	
4	Q Well, it's a matter of dividing two numbers,	
5	isn't it?	10:53AM
6	A Yes.	
7	Q And can you identify the two numbers that	
8	should be divided?	
9	A Well, I'm having difficulty identifying the	
10	two numbers, and I apologize for that, but I can	10:53AM
11	tell you that his his estimate was 79 percent of	
12	the total cattle in the case of this calculation,	
13	and by using by using then the time exposed to	
14	the watershed of loafing versus grazing time, he	
15	calculated then a percentage of manure.	10:54AM
16	Q Tell me, sir, what did you do to verify and	
17	validate the calculations to arrive at the 79.44	
18	percent number?	
19	A Nothing.	
20	Q Okay. All right. Let me hand you Exhibit 47,	10:54AM
21	Dr. Clay. Do you recognize that document from your	
22	appendices?	
23	A Yes.	
24	Q Tell the court what this document is.	
25	A This is density of cattle relative to square	10:54AM

		Page 394
1	mile.	And the second s
2	Q Okay. Who prepared this map? Let me back up.	
3	Who did the calculations that underlie the data that	
4	created this map?	
5	A We did the calculations, and Tim Sullivan did	10:55AM
6	the map.	
7	Q All right. When you say we did the	
8	calculation, are you referring to yourself and Dr.	
9	Jobes?	
10	A Yes.	10:55AM
11	Q And what part of the calculation did you	
12	perform?	
13	A Well, these are the total cattle density I	
14	mean, the total cattle numbers per ZIP Code.	
15	Q What part of the calculations did you perform	10:55AM
16	in preparing the underlying data that created the	
17	map?	
18	A Well, I participated in the development of	
19	those, and I don't remember specifically which	
20	numbers I wrote down.	10:55AM
21	Q Did you operate the computer with a	
22	spreadsheet in it in order to crunch the numbers?	
23	A Dr. Jobes did that.	
24	Q All right, and the data that was used came	
25	from the 2002 Ag Census; is that correct?	10:55AM
1		

			Page 395
1	A	That's correct.	
2	Q	And the category is from sold or inventory?	
3	A	The category is from the way we calculated it,	
4	which	included cattle in inventory of both other	
5	cattle	e as well as beef cows.	10:56AM
6	Q	Okay. So rather than sold, you're using	
7	invent	tory numbers again; correct?	
8	Α	That is correct.	
9	Q	All right, and did you rely on how did you	
10	place	them on the map, based upon subwatersheds or	10:56AM
11	ZIP Co	ode?	
12	А	ZIP Code.	
13	Q	All right, and you did that for both sides,	
14	Arkan	sas and Oklahoma; correct?	
15	А	Yes.	10:56AM
16	Q	How did you were there in your beef cattle	
17	numbe	rs any asterisks shown in the census data that	
18	would	not have been picked up in this calculation?	
19	A	No.	
20	Q	So the beef in fact, it's true, if you look	10:56AM
21	at th	at schedule that shows the Ag Census data,	
22	there	doesn't appear to be any asterisks in the	
23	colum	ns under the ZIP Codes for the beef categories,	:
24	is th	ere?	
25	A	No.	10:57AM

		Page 423
1	A Okay. Then in that case, that would mean	20.345
2	cattle, as well as anyone else, poultry people, so	
3	on, and so I do believe that that that providing	
4	that education to them on the regulations that exist	1.00
5	are extremely important.	12:47PM
6	Q Do you have an opinion of those who fail to	<b>※</b> 2000年2月
7	attend education classes in Oklahoma that are	
8	required as to whether or not that they're acting as	100 April 100 Ap
9	good stewards of the environment?	
10	MS. LONGWELL: Object to the form.	12:47PM
11	MR. BOND: Object to the form.	
12	MR. GRAVES: And beyond the scope.	
13	A Well, I guess I would have to know what the	
14	circumstances are and question if they are truly	
15	applying litter to their property or if they're	12:47PM
16	applying animal manure to their properties, then	
17	they are obligated by law to get some education.	
18	Q I believe you said somewhere in your report	
19	that the State has not produced any evidence of	
20	violations of cattlemen. Is that a fair paraphrase	12:48PM
21	of your statement of your report?	
22	A I think that's right.	
23	Q Okay. Have you in your preparation of your	
24	report, and specifically making that statement,	
25	examined ODAFF, Oklahoma Department of Agriculture,	12:48PM

		Page 424
1	records regarding violations involving poultry	
2	waste?	
3	A Well, I did communicate with people about who	
4	that might have acquired their 15 points or	
5	whatever, and they didn't have any.	12:48PM
6	Q My question is, did you review the public	
7	documents available of ODAFF records?	
8	A I did not review all of the public documents	
9	available.	
10	Q All right. Let me hand you what's been marked	12:48PM
11	as Exhibit 32, and I'll represent to you these are	
12	documents coming from Oklahoma Department of	
13	Agriculture records indicating apparent violations	
14	or problems with regard to the handling and	
15	disposition of poultry waste in accordance to the	12:49PM
16	records of the ODAFF office. Do you know or have	
17	you heard of a W. A. or Bev Saunders who are poultry	
18	growers?	
19	A I have.	
20	Q They're also a cattle operation, are they not?	12:49PM
21	A They are.	
22	Q And the first page of this document, which is	
23	OKDA 16162, indicates a letter written to W. A. and	
24	Bev Saunders in 2003 for violations of educational	į
25	requirements. Do you consider	12:49PM
1		

		Page 429
1	reference, and it's signed by Terry Peach. Have you	
2	ever seen a document similar to this where an	
3	adjudication was made with regard to violations of	
4	the Poultry Act?	20 20 21 21 21
5	MR. BOND: Object to the form.	12:55PM
6	A No.	
7	Q Do you know that the whether or not the	
8	laws and regulations of the Poultry Act provide for	
9	fines to be assessed on an occurrence of violations?	
10	A They do.	12:55PM
11	Q Do you see Paragraph 3 of this page, 16944,	
12	that there appears to be a hundred dollar penalty	
13	imposed?	
14	A I see that.	
15	Q Next page is an inspector's report. I don't	12:56PM
16	know whether yours got highlighted. Look at the	
17	handwritten portion of this document	
18	MR. BOND: Does that have a Bates number?	
19	MR. GARREN: Yeah. 17711.	
20	Q where it starts, however, a litter sample.	12:56PM
21	Do you see that sentence?	
22	A Just a moment, sir.	
23	Q Sure.	
24	A I'm looking at what I have here.	
25	MR. TUCKER: What page are you looking at?	12:56PM

		Page 431
1	documents provided from ODAFF were provided for this	
2	watershed.	
3	A Well, it doesn't say here anywhere.	
4	Q Right. I'm not sure what order these are in,	
5	but, yeah, numerical order. I'm just going to skip	12:58PM
6	through some of these. I don't intend to read all	
7	of these into the Record. It's laborious. Skip	
8	over to Page 21114. You see a letter dated January	
9	24, 2002?	
10	MR. TUCKER: Is that pretty far back?	12:59PM
11	MR. GARREN: No. It's in numerical order	
12	on the pages, though they skip.	
13	Q This letter states from Michelle Sutton,	
14	Esquire, from administrator, Poultry Program Water	
15	Quality Services to a Michelle Worley in Westville,	12:59PM
16	that based upon this inspection, you are in	
17	violation of the following: Oklahoma Registered	
18	Poultry Feeding Operations Act laws and rules,	
19	failure to change the name on the waste management	
20	named and inclusion of current litter and soil	12:59PM
21	tests, and they allow them the opportunity to	
22	rectify the violations. Do you see that?	
23	A I'm looking for it. Yes.	
24	Q Have you spoken to anybody in the enforcement	
25	area of ODAFF with regard to violations that occur	01:00PM
1		

		Page 432
1	that may not have imposed fines on the growers or	
2	producers?	
3	A No.	
4	Q Okay. Did you undertake any inquiry or	
5	investigation into the ODAFF personnel with regard	01:00PM
6	to whether violations are occurring under the	
7	Poultry Feeding Registration Act in Oklahoma?	
8	A No.	
9	MR. BOND: Object to the form.	
10	A Oh, excuse me.	01:00PM
11	Q Let's skip over to page OKDA 14217. That	
12	appears to be out of order now that I look at it.	
13	It comes after Page 21600.	
14	A Okay. The number is 14217?	
15	Q Yes, sir. This is a memorandum that was sent	01:01PM
16	by Mr. Parrish of the ODAFF and was sent to	
17	according to Mr. Parrish, it was sent to	
18	integrators. Do you see in this memorandum where it	
19	says, I've enclosed a list of Oklahoma registered	
20	poultry operations that identify your company as	01:01PM
21	their integrator, and those operations have not	
22	submitted animal management plans to ODAFF. Do you	
23	see that sentence?	
24	A I do see that.	
25	Q Would that indicate to you a potential	01:01PM
}		:

		Page 433
1	violation of the law or regulations?	
2	MS. LONGWELL: Object to the form.	
3	A It does what it is, is that they're	
4	conducting their business as per usual in an attempt	
5	to educate all the people into this law that is	01:01PM
6	being incorporated into the state of Oklahoma.	
7	Q Do you see the date of this memorandum?	
8	A Yes.	
9	Q It's April of '04, isn't it?	
10	A It is.	01:02PM
11	Q That's six years after the law went into	
12	effect; correct?	
13	A That's right. I have not looked at it to find	
14	out if these are active poultry producers. I don't	
15	have any information from any of these people as to	01:02PM
16	whether these may have been out of business since	
17	2002. I don't know.	
18	Q All right. Let me just show you some pictures	
19	that show up in Cargill files that were produced in	
20	this case.	01:02PM
21	A What page are we on?	
22	Q We're going to skip past the first colored	
23	page insert.	
24	MR. TUCKER: We already did that. You mean	
25	the next color insert?	01:02PM

		Page 444
1	tell, can you?	
2	A I don't know. I'm I'm just saying that	
3	this may be a standard operating procedure for this	
4	person.	8. 1. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2.
5	Q And if this occurred in Arkansas, would this	01:15PM
6	be in violation of any rules or regulations of	
7	Arkansas, if you know?	
8	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
9	A Well, likewise, they're not supposed to stack	
10	it in the rain.	01:16PM
11	Q Okay. Would this be an indication of what	
12	appears to be a violation of the handling and	
13	disposition of poultry waste?	
14	A It is	
15	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form. Sorry.	01:16PM
16	A Excuse me. It appears to be from what is	
17	presented to me. I don't have enough information	
18	and data to know about it.	
19	Q Okay, but in preparing for your report and	
20	making your opinions in that report, you had the	01:16PM
21	opportunity and availability to go to ODAFF and	
22	examine the records that are on file there, do you	
23	not do you agree?	
24	MS. LONGWELL: Object to form.	
25	MR. BOND: Object to form.	01:16PM

			i.
			Page 445
1	A	I did. I did have the opportunity to go to	
2	ODAFF.	. Early when I tried that, ODAFF wasn't all	
3	that 1	receptive.	
4	Q	Early is when, sir?	
5	А	Would have been 2005 or '6 '5.	01:16PM
6	Q	Was it before June of '05?	
7	A	I don't remember exactly what date it was, but	
8	it co	ald have been late '05, could have been early	
9	'06.		
10	Q	When were you hired in this case?	01:17PM
11	A	I don't remember.	
12	Q	Were you hired at the time you went?	
13	A	Yes. It was shortly after I was hired,	
14	whate	ver date that is.	
15	Q	Okay.	01:17PM
16	A	And I don't remember that date.	
17	Q	And did you physically go to the ODAFF records	
18	offic	e?	
19	A	No. I talked to them on the phone.	
20	Q	All right, and did they tell you you couldn't	01:17PM
21	come	there to look at records?	
22	А	They didn't tell me I couldn't come.	
23		MR. GRAVES: You guys are talking over each	
24	other	again.	
25	А	Thank you. Thank you very much for reminding	01:17PM

		Page 446
1	me.	
2	Q Did you ask to see any records at ODAFF?	
3	A I didn't at that time, to ask to see the	:
4	records.	
5	Q Did you at any time ask to see records at	01:17PM
6	ODAFF?	
7	A I asked if they would provide me with some	
8	records, but they were not willing to do that.	
9	Q And who did you talk to?	
10	A I don't I probably wrote down a name but I	01:17PM
11	don't remember the name.	
12	Q Okay. Do you know that the poultry integrator	
13	defendants went to ODAFF for several days and pulled	
14	records from their original records and had them	
15	copied?	01:18PM
16	A I don't.	
17	Q Did you inquire of the defendants in this case	
18	or their counsel whether or not they had ODAFF	
19	records for you to review before you made the	
20	statement about violations?	01:18PM
21	A I did not.	
22	Q Did anybody volunteer to you that those	
23	records were available that they had acquired and	
24	procured from the offices of ODAFF?	
25	A No. I made that statement after reading the	01:18PM

		Page 447
1	deposition.	
2	Q Whose deposition I'm sorry.	
3	A It's on there. The reference is on there.	
4	Q Let me hand you what's been marked as Exhibit	
5	23. Are you familiar with J. P. Graham and his	01:18PM
6	article of Antibiotic-Resistant Enterococci that's	
7	listed here?	
8	A I don't remember this one.	
9	Q Do you see where it's published in 2008?	
10	A Yes.	01:19PM
11	MR. BOND: Has this document been produced,	
12	Rick?	
13	MR. GARREN: No. It's been downloaded by	
14	me.	
15	MR. TUCKER: I'm trying to figure out where	01:19PM
16	it was published. Can you tell?	
17	Q Looking at the first sentence of the abstract	
18	it says, use of antibiotics as feed additives	
19	MR. TUCKER: Can you tell me where this was	
20	published?	01:19PM
21	MR. GARREN: Please don't interrupt me. If	
22	you'll read the document, Counsel, you might be able	
23	to tell on your own. It has a copyright notice on	
24	it.	
25	MR. TUCKER: I'd appreciate it if you would	01:19PM